

of people the opportunity to get a quality education. We can accomplish both of these goals and provide college athletics with the certainty that it needs.

In February, I introduced the Amateur Athletes Protection and Compensation Act—my proposal to accomplish this necessary balance. My legislation would create a single set of guidelines that would enable amateur athletes to profit from their name, image, and likeness by prohibiting conferences, schools, and athletic associations, like the NCAA, from rendering an amateur intercollegiate athlete ineligible on the basis of receiving that NIL compensation. It would also codify serious athlete protections like extended healthcare coverage for athletic injuries or illness and scholarship guarantees.

I understand this legislation is not perfect in everyone's eyes. It is not perfect in its current form, but it offers not only the quickest but the best path towards enacting meaningful Federal legislation on issues of amateur athletic name, image, and likeness.

When I say it may not be perfect, there are certainly things that we can negotiate to improve, and it is not the extreme on either side of this issue, but it is something that a broad set of Senators, Members of the House, and a President could come behind and certainly is perhaps the only piece of legislation that has a chance of being enacted anytime soon. I recognize there are many ideas on what should and should not be included in an NIL bill, and I welcome those conversations with my colleagues.

I strongly encourage the U.S. Senate, the Commerce Committee, and my colleagues on that committee to act quickly on this urgent matter and join us in this legislation to make progress on this important issue. The time is short, but if we work together, we can accomplish a goal that is needed in this country and accomplish it by the time that it is needed to occur.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, for the past 41 years, I have toured our State to hear from Iowa workers, our community leaders, and our farmers at my annual 99 county meetings. So far this year, I have been in 71.

As a farmer myself, I enjoy speaking with those involved in agriculture all across the State who tell me that they are third-, fourth-, fifth-generation farmers. These folks use the same soil and barns as their grandfathers before

them. Everyone I speak with intends to leave their land to their children and leave it better than they found it. That goes way back to it being entrusted to their care. We all have that responsibility.

Between the use of cover crops, buffer strips, no-till farming, and minimal-till farming, more conservation practices than ever before are being used on Iowa's 35 million acres of farmland. While Iowa farmers are continuing to feed our country and the world, they are also doing so with fewer inputs and better soil and water outcomes.

Iowa farmers should be congratulated; however, it seems like there is always a target on the backs of Iowa farmers and I could say for maybe all American farmers. I want to get to that target, and that has something to do with this map that I have here of the State of Iowa.

Last week, it was reported that the Biden administration is moving forward to add redtape to their operations by rewriting President Trump's navigable waters protection rule. In my first telephone conversation with then-EPA nominee Administrator Regan and now the confirmed Administrator—by the way, confirmed by a unanimous vote of this Senate—I warned Administrator Regan against moving back to the Obama-era waters of the U.S. rule, which we call WOTUS for short. That is a regulation they shouldn't move back to because of the burden it placed on rural areas, including Iowa farmers.

In fact, under the old waters rule, 97 percent of Iowa's land would have been subject to jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. In other words, all of the blue part of Iowa—with the exceptions of these areas that are white that adds up to the blue area—97 percent of this land mass of Iowa would be subject to Federal jurisdiction. Adding more Federal redtape to a farmer's day-to-day decisions on the farm is government overreach, plain and simple.

But besides Iowa's 86,000 farmers, a change in the Trump navigable waters protection rule will also result in significant redtape and significant expense for, among others, homebuilders, golf course managers, and construction companies as they make very routine decisions about how best to use the land and run their businesses.

Now, imagine that, not only have new home prices risen due to inflation and soaring lumber prices—and, by the way, lumber prices have added \$36,000 to the price of a house just in the last year. Now, instead of that happening because lumber prices have gone up, now home prices, because of this proposed change in the regulation, will increase due to additional permitting that wasn't previously needed.

To clear up common confusion, the Trump-era rule that is now the law of the land did not give polluters free rein to discharge pollutions with no regard to the health of our Nation's waterways. Regulating the discharge of pol-

lution into waterways is important and is done through other parts of the Clean Water Act.

The Trump rule made sure that where routine land use decisions were being made with little or no environmental impact, then those decisions would not be regulated by the Federal Government. EPA's release about its intention to overturn the navigable waters protection rule, which is the Trump rule, mentions that 333 projects would have required permits by the Obama waters rule that did not need government paperwork under the navigable waters protection rule of the Trump administration, and, of course, that is exactly the point—exactly the point of what was wrong with the WOTUS rule.

If you are simply moving dirt to level off a low point in a field, should that need a Federal permit? If a golf course is fixing a bunker or flattening a green, should that need a Federal permit? The obvious commonsense answer to both of these questions and a lot of other questions that can be put out there for speculative purposes is, What good does this redtape do for anyone? I want to underline that point.

My Republican colleagues and I want clean water and healthy soil for our families and our communities. This is important. But what I don't want is a Federal Government power grab that adds so much redtape to routine land use decisions that it slows our economy to a halt.

If the Biden administration decides to go down this road of reverting to the old Obama-era WOTUS, they will be seriously misguided. Why should you put the farmers of Iowa, as well as the other people, with many even having to get a permit to do normal farming practices—it just doesn't make sense.

For an administration that is so focused on updating our Nation's infrastructure, why does it make sense to propose a rule that only adds costs and delays construction with no identifiable benefit?

I urge President Biden and EPA Administrator Regan to listen to the farmers and land owners across the country. Wave the WOTUS rule goodbye. Put away the redtape that is going to come around as a result of what you are planning to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last month, more than 180,000 migrants crossed our southern border. That is the highest monthly total since the Clinton administration.